

Revision of the Authorized
Version. The English Bible
and Our Duty With Regard To It.
By Philalethes.

DUBLIN, McGlashan & Gill, 1857.

With the Author's regards

REVISION OF THE AUTHORIZED VERSION.

THE
E N G L I S H B I B L E,
AND
OUR DUTY WITH REGARD TO IT.

With an Appendix,
CONTAINING A CONCORDANCE OF THE MOST IMPORTANT TERMS IN THE
NEW TESTAMENT COMPARED WITH THE ORIGINAL GREEK,
ADAPTED TO THE ENGLISH READER.

BY
P H I L A L E T H E S.

DUBLIN:
M^oGLASHAN & GILL, 50, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET.
LONDON: WHITTAKER AND CO., AVE-MARIA-LANE.

1857.

DUBLIN:
Printed at the University Press,
BY M. H. GILL.

REVISION OF THE AUTHORIZED VERSION,

&c. &c.



FEW great works are commenced and completed in a single effort. It is needful that many successive labourers should unite their energies, in order that even a tolerable degree of perfection may be attained. At each step new difficulties and new objections arise, but no sooner are they overcome than it is forgotten that they ever existed, and instead of increasing wisdom and increased encouragement from previous success, we find that before the succeeding step is contemplated, the gradual character of the advance already made is lost sight of. It is imagined that by fortunate accident, the institution, whatever it may be, reached almost absolute perfection at one bound, and that it is dangerous to expect similar good fortune, if it be meddled with again. This feeling naturally adds strength to the old objections which are sure to be revived, stronger, if possible, from having been overcome. In the case of the English Bible, which may be called an institution of our country, these causes have certainly operated, but they have been assisted by others peculiar. The general and deserved admiration which has been yielded to it has led to the neglect of all other existing or possible versions. With many persons there is no medium between perfection and worthlessness; what is not infallible cannot be trustworthy. The general excellence of the English Version being admitted, its perfection is assumed, and therefore all preceding and subsequent versions must be unworthy of notice; nay, even the original text need not be consulted. The steps by which the present excellence of our

Version was attained are wholly forgotten. Its noble language is supposed to bear the stamp of the age of James I. ; and its accuracy is attributed to the learning and judgment of the translators of 1611. It is generally taken for granted that the translations existing before that date were obsolete and faulty ; while there was a general demand for a new one, which was accordingly executed by the special command, and, as is of course supposed, at the expense of that "most high and mighty prince," King James.* It is further imagined that this Version, either by royal authority, or by its own surpassing excellency, at once superseded all its predecessors. Its superiority we are ready to admit to the fullest extent ; with regard to the New Testament especially, we do not believe that there exists in the language any translation of any book which can compare with it ; and, considering the number of labourers who were united in its production, it would be strange if it were otherwise. It is still, however, capable of improvement. The eulogies, indeed, bestowed upon it, often extravagant and undiscriminating, if they have not led to a half conscious belief that the translators were inspired, have at least left the impression that no wise man has ever dreamed of desiring a better version. It is not strange, then, that any proposal for its improvement should be looked upon with as much alarm as if the British Constitution were to be revised, or the Scriptures themselves brought up to the present state of science. Moreover, the aversion to meddle with what has been so long admired is naturally mingled with a vague fear of some dreadful innovation, some terrible shock to our most cherished feelings. Who can tell what may be imposed on us as Scripture if we once give way to the rage for "improvement"? Let us then, it is said, rather imitate the wisdom of our forefathers, and firmly hold to what they have bequeathed to us. Be it so ; but it must be remembered, that besides the results of their labours, they have left us the history of their own experience, and, in the present case, as in all others, it will doubtless teach us a useful lesson.

* The King, says Lord Mansfield, "the King paid the expenses of it, and therefore it is his property." There is no foundation for this statement.

It is not my design to enter in detail into the history of the English Bible, but there are some misapprehensions which it is necessary to remove. It is, perhaps, of little consequence to observe, that the received Version has never been, strictly speaking, authorized, for, in such a case, use and familiarity are authority sufficient. But it is important to remember, that it is not a new translation, but a revision; nor is it the result of a single revision, but is several steps removed from its original. In fact, its excellence is due in great part to the number of revisions through which it has passed. If no country enjoys a more faithful version, in no country have there been so many revisions successively received. And it is worthy of notice that all of these were the result of private energy, and undertaken at private expense. It was not so in other countries. In Germany, a century before the Reformation, a translation was commenced at the Imperial expense; in later times the Swedish, Norse, and other versions have had public assistance. The Danish has been four times revised by order of as many kings; and a King of Denmark appointed at his own expense a travelling commission for the collation of manuscripts. But in England, from Henry VIII. to the present time, no monarch has promoted, except by words, the vernacular translation. Henry, indeed, interested himself more than any succeeding prince in the question of the circulation of the Scriptures; and it was in his reign that the two first complete versions were issued, almost simultaneously, and both sanctioned by royal authority.

Coverdale's had been printed abroad in the latter end of 1535, but as he would not venture to publish it without the sanction of the King, it seems to have remained in the printer's hands, awaiting the royal pleasure until 1537. In that year Coverdale succeeded in obtaining from the King, through Cromwell, permission for the public use of the English Bible. But in that year also appeared another version (Matthewe's) which was eagerly taken up by Cranmer, who procured its authorization by name. More than half the Old Testament in this Bible, and all the New, were of Tyndale's translation; the remainder was founded on Coverdale, revised,

probably, by John Rogers.* Tyndale's New Testament had been already many years in use; it had been revised more than once, and had passed through numerous editions,† but with all Tyndale's works had been prohibited. The adoption of the fictitious name *Matthewe* was not therefore useless; the works which were prohibited under Tyndale's name were under *Matthewe's*,—"Licensed to be sold and read of every person, without danger of any act, proclamation, or ordinance heretofore granted to the contrary." Authority and familiarity being thus both in favour of this Bible, Coverdale's never came into general use. His New Testament was indeed reprinted several times, but of the whole Bible of Coverdale's version only one‡ edition appeared between 1537 and 1838, when it was reprinted by Mr. Bagster. Subsequent translators paid less attention to it than it deserved, if, indeed, they consulted it at all. As Tyndale was the first and best translator from the original,§ so his work became not only the most popular, but the parent of all succeeding versions on this basis.

* Tyndale's initials are subscribed to the Old Testament. How much assistance was obtained from his MSS. cannot, of course, be ascertained.

† Twenty-three, before 1537, each consisting, probably, of at least 1500 to 2000 copies. The first was of 3000 copies, and the second appeared the same year. The demand anticipated for the Scriptures in 1535 has been often estimated by the number of copies said to have been printed of Coverdale's first edition, namely, 500. The large circulation of Testaments before that time would give a different result. It may be added, that before 1542 at least sixteen distinct editions of the whole Bible were issued, consisting of 1500 to 2500 copies each.

‡ This edition (which appeared in 1550), was re-issued with a new title in 1553. This only shows the difficulty of disposing of Coverdale's translation.

§ That Coverdale translated from the original tongues has been satisfactorily shown by Mr. Whittaker ("Histor. and Crit. Inquiry," &c., 1819) and Dr. Walter ("Letter to Bp. Marsh," &c., 1823). Mr. Anderson ("Annals of Eng. Bible") adopts their conclusions; yet Dr. Cotton remarks:—"We readily concede to Mr. Anderson that Coverdale did not translate from the originals."—*Pref. to List of Edd. of Eng. Bible.*

To illustrate the inferiority (in some respects) of Coverdale's version, it will be sufficient to cite the words—"There shall be joy in heaven over one sinner that doeth penance." But penance had not the same restricted meaning then as now. See the definition of it in Chaucer, "The Persones Tale."

Many revisions appeared within the eighty years following: the principal of which were the Great Bible, the Genevan, the Bishops', and that now received. Notwithstanding these repeated alterations, the language we now read is essentially Tyndale's. As an illustration of this I shall refer to a single passage,—the account of the anointing of our Lord in the Pharisee's house.* I select this because we can refer to Tyndale's first draft of the translation, dated 1502, twenty-three years before his first printed edition, and long before Luther had commenced his translation. The extract will be found in the memoir of Tyndale by Mr. Offor. We find, then, in these fifteen verses only twelve variations between this ancient manuscript and our present edition, and these are for the most part such differences as 'lender' for 'creditor;' 'as soon as' for 'when;' 'answered and said' for 'answering said;' and the like.† Other passages might show greater variety, and others again less; and the changes are generally for the better in point of accuracy; yet, on the whole, we are justified in saying that the simple, sublime, and pure language of our English Bible is due to Tyndale and Coverdale. Their successors have followed worthily in their steps; and in their own order have contributed to make us the possessors of 'the best translation in the world.' Valuable as the inheritance is, we owe them something more valuable still.

They have left us a lesson on our duty to the Word of God and to our brethren, which has been too little heeded. They saw how inconsistent it would be to maintain the common right of all Christians to the pure Word, and yet to imitate the Romish Church by virtually teaching the infallibility of a version. As learned men, they felt that to them was intrusted the key of knowledge of the Scriptures; and that if, through their mistaken reverence for human authority, the words of the Holy Scripture were misinterpreted or misunderstood, they must answer for it. We have, if possible, a stronger obligation. For, not to dwell on the duties

* Luke, vii., 36-50.

† One accurate correction occurs in ver. 47:—"Her sins, which are many," where Tyndale and all before the Authorized Version had "many sins."

which a more exact scholarship imposes, the importance of accuracy in the English Version is vastly increased. In this country it has established an absolutely exclusive authority, being regarded almost as an original; while it does actually and perhaps unavoidably stand in the place of the original to many tongues, and doubtless will to many yet unknown. It has become the sole ultimate appeal of millions both of our own and other branches of the human family, and the numbers of those who thus look up to it are multiplying daily. Is this a reason for acquiescing in its imperfections? Does it not, on the contrary, make it more and more imperative to remove every spot, in order that our Version may reflect its original as clearly, as faithfully, and as thoroughly as human skill, with the Divine help, can effect? Yes, and that it be done speedily; for every delay, as it makes the necessity more pressing, renders the obstacles more formidable. There are, indeed, some to whom the vast importance of the English Version, especially in its relation to foreign languages, renders even its blemishes sacred; but it only makes us feel more strongly that no duty can be more solemn, no task more noble, than that of rendering that Version a more perfect counterpart of the primitive text. For this, Tyndale and Coverdale, Cranmer and Whittingham laboured, and we are the inheritors of their labours, and of their obligations too.

“Therefore blessed be they and most honoured be their name, that breake the ice, and give thonset upon that which helpeth forward to the saving of souls.—Yet for all that, as nothing is begun and perfited at the same time, and the later thoughts are thought to be the wiser; so if we building upon their foundation that went before vs, and being holpen by their labours, doe endeavour to make that better which they left so good; no man, we are sure, hath cause to mislike vs; they, we perswade our selves, if they were alive, would thank vs. The vintage of Abiezer that strake the stroake; yet the gleaning of grapes of Ephraim was not to be despised.”*

Two centuries and a half have clapscd since these words were

* Preface to Edition of 1611.

written. Have Christian scholars been idle all that time? Has no light been thrown on the “very many darke places in the Gospelles,” which Bishop Fisher expected “without al doubt to the posteritie shalbe made much more open,” seeing, as he says, “the Gospel was delivered to this intent, that it might be utterly understanded of us?” Nay, we may rather ask in what period has so great progress been made? The many learned and pious men with whose works the press daily teems have not toiled in vain. Of this we need no other testimony than that of a writer who was understood to assert recently that Biblical scholarship and research had retrograded since the days of Augustine and of Chrysostom. It is with pleasure that we appeal to the more deliberate judgment of the same writer. He has thus expressed, in language much more becoming, his own unbiased views:—

“What progress has been made in the understanding of the Bible from the days of Ignatius to those of Augustine, from those of Augustine to those of Calvin, from those of Calvin to the present moment!—The true Fathers of the Church are the best Biblical scholars of the nineteenth century. We have all that Augustine and Chrysostom had, and, in addition, we have the lights of Science, the results of patient and protracted inquiry; and the very blunders that they made are the beacons that keep us from falling into similar errors; so that the presumption is that we shall have a far clearer exposition of the Bible from the learned and pious men of the nineteenth century than from those who lived in the dawn, and were less enlightened in the truths of the Gospel of Christ.”*

And if Providence has granted us a clearer light in the progress of time, and left this light under the responsible control of a few, what are they, and what are we, that we should say to others:—“This light is for us alone: it is good that you continue to walk in the feebler light of dawn, and leave more accurate knowledge to the priests and scribes.” No: let the Hebraist and the Grecian, the scholar and the divine, reverently lend their aid to make all their brethren, as far as may be, partakers of the same light. But how? Is it by the chance remarks of a second-rate or tenth-rate

• Dr. Cumming, “Voices of the Night,” pp. 349, 350.

scholar in the pulpit? This is indeed the way to unsettle men's minds; for thereby they learn only that the English Version is not always to be trusted, but when or what else to trust they know not. Nevertheless, every scholar is obliged to have recourse to this manner of correction, if he would not deal with the Word of God deceitfully. And if there be no revision, such partial and "unsettling" corrections must and will be made for ages to come. There is plainly but one way to restore a well-founded confidence in the English Bible,—not surely by weakly disguising its imperfections, but by honestly labouring to remove them. It is not likely that to supply a trustworthy standard (in text and margin), in place of the uncertainty of pulpit criticism, would "unsettle the minds, and shake the faith" of any who esteem truth more than tradition. It is a false faith that is based on human infallibility.

If, however, such a result is seriously to be feared, our duty is plain. We have no right to enshrine any human work as an object of religious faith. Whatever be its value or its sanctity, though it were the autograph of an Apostle, or the handiwork of the Prophet and Lawgiver, if it be an object of idolatry, let it be Ne-hushtan. If the exclusive adoption of one version ends in the rejection of the originals, let variety be encouraged. Such variety has been recommended by wise and good men. For example, Bengel remarks that "the Church has need of multiplied versions of the sacred writings. That their multiplication is sanctioned by the practice of the earliest times. That Luther himself wished a great many more besides his own might become current in the Protestant Church." So also Coverdale and Parker in their prefaces. Thus the former:—"Sure I am that there commeth more knowlege and vnderstandinge of the Scripture by theyr sondrie translations then by all the gloses of oure sophistical doctours. For that one interpreteth som thyng obsecrly in one place, the same translateth another (or els he him selfe) more manifestly by a more playne vocable of the same meanyng in another place."

But to come nearer home: we have of an important portion of Scripture two Authorized Versions, differing in almost every respect in which two translations can differ, by omission, addition, and contradiction. Not only, indeed, are these both authorized,

but both are in everybody's hands, and yet we hear of no disastrous consequences. It may be said that few readers are at the pains to compare them. We need not say on which side of the argument this circumstance tells. But over and above this, the English Bible carries with it in every page the profession of its own imperfection. The translators would not encourage the belief that every syllable in their version was stamped with Divine authority. They scrupulously appeal to the Hebrew verity, not only giving the literal signification of idiomatic expressions, but stating candidly where either text or translations appeared to them doubtful. In this they have set an admirable example both to critics and translators; yet they saw that their plan was open to the same objections as the revision itself, and their reply deserves to be well weighed:—"Some peradventure would have no varietie of sences to be set in the margine, lest the authoritie of the Scriptures for deciding of controversies by that shew of uncertaintie should some what be shaken.—In such a case doth not a margine do well to admonish the reader to seeke further, and not to conclude or dogmatise vpon this or that peremptorily?—To determine of such things as the Spirit of God hath left (even in the iudgment of the iudicious) questionable, can be no lesse than presumption. Therefore, as S. Augustine saith, that varietie of Translations is profitable for the finding out of the sense of the Scriptures; so diversitie of signification and sense in the margine, where the text is not so cleare, must needes doe good, yea, is necessary as we are perswaded. We know that Sixtus Quintus expresly forbiddeth, that any varietie of readings of their vulgar edition, should be put in the margine, but we thinke he hath not all of his owne side his favourers for this conceit. They that are wise, had rather have their iudgements at libertie in differences of readings then to be captivated to one, when it may be the other. If they were sure that their hic Priest had all laws shut up in his brest as Paul the Second bragged, and that he were as free from error by speciall priviledge

* The number of these marginal readings may be usefully increased without any appeal to authority; in fact, many have been added since 1611, chiefly by Dr. Blayney, in the Oxford Edition of 1769, which has since become the standard

as the Dictators of Rome were by law inviolable, it were an other matter; then his word were an Oracle, his opinion a decision."* These words are equally applicable to the similar objections to a revision, the most popular of which are in fact refuted by the very existence of those marginal readings, from which every reader learns the occasional uncertainty of the text. But let us look a little closer into the past and see whether we may not learn a lesson from its history.

Had these obstructive counsels prevailed heretofore, we should now have been reading a Version of a Latin Translation of the Greek Testament and Septuagint. Fourteen centuries ago, when every Church in the Latin world had its own received version made from the Greek, there were weighty reasons for objecting to any change. The received version, it might be said, was made in the earliest times, perhaps from the very autographs of the Apostles,† by some of those to whom the Epistles or Gospels were addressed, and what presumption is it now to endeavour to improve it! or will any one pretend to understand Hebrew better than the Seventy inspired or almost inspired men whose version has been stamped with the authority of our Lord and his Apostles?‡ In clear passages they cannot but be right; in obscure, can we know better than they? Moreover, Hebrew is a language little known, and all who are ignorant of it will look on new renderings with suspicion, which cannot be done away by appeal to the original. Already, said they, in one Church where the bishop had caused Jerome's version of Jonah to be read, what a tumult occurred in consequence of one alteration! and the Jews, when appealed to, decided against Jerome.§

* Preface, Edition of 1611.

† One copy of the old Latin version of St. Mark's Gospel was supposed to be itself the original autograph, and cut out by its venerated from the volume to which it belonged.

‡ See August. Hieronymo, Ep. 71.

§ Jerome conjectures that the alteration which gave offence was,—that in Jonah, iv. 6, where, in accordance with the majority of interpreters, he read "ivy" (hederam) for want of a better word, "si cucurbitam, id dicerem quod in Hebrew non habetur." The Jews, he says, if not ignorant, were mocking. The plant is *Ricinus*; in our margin, *palmcrist*, i.e. *Palma Christi*. Coverdale has "Wild vyne."

By these arguments Augustine sought to persuade Jerome to cast aside the Hebrew, and translate from the Septuagint; but Jerome manfully persevered in his noble but hazardous work. His detractors affirmed that he wished to flout the LXX. by making new currency in lieu of the old, judging, says he, of intellect as of wine, while he protested that he did but make an offering to the best of his power in the tabernacle of God. In every book he is obliged to defend himself against the railing of his adversaries; yet he declares, with the help of Christ, he will never be silent. In the New Testament he had more serious discouragement. It was presumptuous to sit in judgment on others who had preceded him; and, when the world had grown hoary, to call it back to the elements, and force it to learn a new tongue. For, saith he, when any one learned or unlearned finds what he reads different from that which he drank in with his mother's milk, will he not at once exclaim that I am a sacrilegious forger, who dare to add, alter, or correct aught in the ancient books?* Yet in a single generation, none but were grateful for Jerome's perseverance, if indeed they bestowed a thought upon the resistance he met with. The same resistance, however, has continued to obstruct every step in the progress of truth, being as constantly forgotten as soon as overcome, for the advocates of stagnation are as neglectful of the past as of the future. The world, which to Jerome appeared to be growing hoary, has lived to grow old again in other tongues; and in every age there have been men who would still be teaching and striving to raise their brethren to their own level of knowledge and truth; while others protest against disturbing the peace of the world's old age, and think, or seem to think, that posterity there will be none. If there be any, surely "what served our fathers ought to serve them." It is a mistake to suppose that our fathers were more easily satisfied than we. Only forty years after the publication of King James's Version a revision was proposed in Parliament; and under Cromwell a Committee was actually appointed for the purpose, but political changes interfered. Again, in 1761, Archhishop Secker

* Prof. in Quatuor Evangelia.

intended to address Convocation on the subject: "That the people may enjoy the light which, by the goodness of God, has been thrown on the Divine Oracles since the English Version was made." Other Bishops also have spoken of a revision as "a necessary work;" Lowth, for example, Newcome, and Horsley. And if the revision does not take place in our day, history may teach us whether posterity will be satisfied because what was good enough for their fathers must be good enough for them. Such, however, is the language used with regard to the translation of the Bible now, and such was the language used in 1604, and, we are thankful to say, without success. "If every man's humour should be followed," said my Lord of London, "there will be no end of translations."* "Hath the Church," said others, "been deceived all this while? Hath her sweet bread been mingled with leaven, her wine with water, her milk with lime?† We hoped that we had been in the right way, that we had the Oracles of God delivered unto us; and that, though all the world had cause to be offended and complain, yet that we had none. Hath the nurse holden out the breast, and nothing but winde in it? Hath the bread been delivered by the Fathers of the Church, and the same proved to be *lapidous*, as Seneca speaketh? What is it to handle the Word of God deceitfully, if this be not? Thus certaine brethren. Also the aduersaries of Judah mocke—We will answer the former, being brethren, thus with S. Hierome: 'Damnamus veteres? Minime; sed post priorum studia in domo Domini quod possumus laboramus.'‡

Had truth been in any degree the object of these "certaine brethren," they could have pointed out many passages in which the older renderings might with advantage be restored. Some of these may be cited as showing that we may often improve without innovation. For example, 1 Cor. xiii. 12: "Now we see in a glasse in a darke speakeynge."—*Tyndale*. And so Genevan. Wycliffe has "bi a mirrour."

* Barlow's "Summe and Substance of Conference," &c.

† London milk, it seems, was made of chalk so early as 1611.

‡ Preface, Edition of 1611.

Gal. iv. 4 : “Borne* of a woman, and made bonde under the law.”—*Tynd.*, *Cor.*, &c. (*ὑπὸ νόμου*).

In 2 Cor. v. 10, 11, the sense has been often mistaken, partly in consequence of the same Greek word being represented in the Authorized Version by two different English words. The meaning is :—“We must all be made manifest before the judgment seat of Christ. . . . Knowing, therefore, the fear of the Lord (being impressed with, feeling the fear—i. e., fearing the Lord), we use perswasion with men, but to God we are manifest, and I hope that we are manifest in your consciences also.” Tyndale (followed by Coverdale, &c.) preserves the sense well : “For we must all be brought before the iudgment seate off Christ, that every man mayc receave the workes off his body accordyng to that he hath done | whether it be good or badde. Seynge then that we knowe howe the Lord is to be feared | we fare fayre with men. For we are knownen wele ynough vnto God. I trust also that we are knownen in your consciences.” The Rheimish Version is nearly as above, except that they have—“knowing the fear of our Lord.” The word *terror* (introduced by the *Genevan* translators after Beza) gives a quite different and wrong sense. The Rhemish translators are quite right, too, in John, x. 14, where the use of *even so* for *and* obscures the sense in our Version. “I know mine, and mine know me, as the Father knoweth me, and I know the Father.” Coverdale had given the true reading here also ; Tyndale not so. Coverdale not unfrequently stands alone in exhibiting the correct rendering. Who ever supposed that gain was godliness, as most versions have it, from ignorance of the force of the Greek article? But that “godliness is lucre,” or a means of gain,

* The word here, and Heb. i. 4, most improperly translated in the English Version “made” (after Beza and the Geneva Version, Tyndale and Coverdale being right), has met with a curious variety of rendering. Though in itself perfectly unambiguous, and well represented by *becoming*, *being born*, *being*, or the like, according to the context, it is rendered by *forty-seven* different English words. The rendering it “finished” in Heb. iv. 8, quite obscures the meaning of the passage. In Acts, i. 22, it is translated (after Tyndale)—“be ordained.” Acts, iv. 4, does not imply the conversion of 5000 in addition to the previous 3000, but the number became five thousand.

as Coverdale correctly has it, seems to be the view taken by too many in the present day.

I believe, too, that the beautiful idea expressed by Tyndale (1st ed.) and Coverdale in 2 Cor. iii. 18, is correct, and suits the connexion better than the common rendering (derived from Tyndale's 2nd ed.): "The lorde's glory apeareth in us all | as in a glasse."—*Tynd.* Let us look at the whole context. And first, it is necessary to note that the passage in Exodus, xxxiv. 30–35, referred to by the Apostle, is misunderstood in consequence of the erroneous insertion of the little word *till* (in Italics) in ver. 33, contrary to the older versions. When Moses came out from before the Lord, and while he spake to the people what he had been commanded, his face shone (not on one occasion only, but always). When he had done speaking, he put the veil on his face, in order that the fading away of the glory might not be observed. The word *till* being omitted, this is at once seen to be the meaning of vv. 33, 34, 35.

Let us now turn to the Apostle, beginning at ver. 7: "But if the ministration of death in the letter, engraven on stones, took place in glory, so that the children of Israel could not fix their eyes on the face of Moses, on account of the glory of his face which was fleeting, how shall not rather the ministration of the Spirit be in glory? For if the fleeting [was ministered] with glory, much more [shall] the abiding [be ministered] in glory. Having then such a hope, we use much opennes, and not as Moses put a veil on his face in order that the children of Israel should not look upon the end of the fleeting; but their thoughts were hardened (their perceptions blunted) for to this day remaineth the same veil in the reading of the old covenant, it not being revealed* that in Christ it [fleeth away or] is done away; but unto this day, whenever Moses is read, a veil lieth on their heart; but whensoever it shall turn to the Lord, the veil is taken away But we all with unveiled face mirroring† the glory

* The word ought to be *re-veiled*, to preserve the paronomasia. *Unveiled*, or *unfolded*, might be suggested.

† "Spiegelt sich in uns des Herrn Klarheit."—*Luther.*

of the Lord, are changing [*present*, are undergoing a change] into the same image from glory to glory, as by the Lord the Spirit." The illustration is continued in the next chapter: "But even if our Gospel is *veiled*, it is in those who are perishing that it is *veiled*" (where the common version has *four* faults in one short verse), "in whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds [perceptions] of the unbelieving, that the enlightening of the Gospel of the glory of Christ, who is the image of God, should not shine upon them," &c.

The contrast is striking and beautiful between Moses shining with a fading brightness, which followed him from the Divine presence, and Christians ALL ever more and more brightly beaming with the glory of the Lord, in whose presence they live, and into whose image they are being transformed.*

We must again give Coverdale the credit of being more correct than our present Version in James, i. 26, 27, where he uses the words 'devout,' 'devotion,' instead of 'religious' and 'religion.' The word used by the Apostle refers only to the outward services of religion, and the use of this word (with its present meaning) perverts his statement into one leading to inferences wholly false and unscriptural. It is not too much to say that this error alone would call imperatively for a revision. Whether the use of the word 'religion' in this place be an archaism or not, I shall not discuss; it has unquestionably come from the Latin, and was certainly not usual in this sense so late as 1611.†

One or two other passages may be mentioned where our Version departs from all its predecessors to follow errors of the Rhemish or of Beza. For example, Tit. ii. 11: "The grace of God | that bryngeth health vnto all men | hath apered."‡—*Tynd.*

* This is not the place to discuss the considerations, lexicographical and grammatical, which appear to me to afford a satisfactory support to this rendering; which has, moreover, the authority of the best Greek commentators in its favour.

† See Trench, "Synonyms of the New Testament," on *θρησκεία*.

‡ The nicety of the word immediately following, *τατείνοντα*, *disciplining* or *schooling*, not merely *teaching*, has, of course, escaped the older translators.

So also in the use of the word *charity* instead of *love* in 1 Cor. xiii. and elsewhere. All the versions before King James are right in Matt. v. 21, &c. : "It was sayd *unto* them off the old tyme."—*Tynd.* It might be imagined that the translators thought it hard to reconcile our Lord's remarks with the divine authority of the laws which He superseded, but they forgot that no interpretation of this passage can affect the fact that the laws are those given by Moses. Beza, indeed, whom they followed, refers the words to the appended clause, "Whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment," but in ver. 27 there is no appendix.

Such instances might be multiplied,* but these are sufficient to justify us in affirming that if the scholars of King James's day had devoted themselves to the study of the Scriptures, and the improvement of the Version, instead of "irrationally desiring to maintain the integrity of the Version against the sense of the original,"† there would now be less reason for requiring a new revision. If Tyndale and Coverdale, working alone, were so successful in 1526 and 1535, what might not have been expected from the united labours of scholars in the succeeding century? Let not the lesson be lost on our age. Let us show ourselves to be the disciples of the noble body of translators who laboured to the best of their ability in the house of God, rather than of those obstructives who were "studious onely to secke quarrels in other men's wcl dooingea"‡. That such was their only function may be inferred from this curious fact. The passages brought forward by Mr. Reynolds, and others, to prove the necessity of a revision of the *Authorized* Version, were quite correctly translated in the

* I have just noted a remarkable case. The words ὁ Θεὸς εἰς πατήσ, the proper rendering of which is of great importance, are wrongly rendered in the Received Version thirteen times out of nineteen, notwithstanding the example of Tyndale, who was uniformly right in at least eighteen of these passages.

† We borrow the words of a learned writer, who thinks a revision "needless and inexpedient;" yet he has no milder words than those in the text for Bois, who had the same objections to a revision of the Vulgate, and that in 1655. Bois, nevertheless, was willing to admit marginal corrections.—Scrivener's "Supplement to the Authorized English Version," p. 78.

‡ *Preface to Bishops' Bible.*

current one ; yet the obstructives never hinted at the fact.* The public, however, decided that the New Version was worthy to be adopted as better fitted to replace the original than any hitherto published.

I say the public, for it has been clearly shewn† that Royal Authority had nothing whatever to say to its success. King, Council, Parliament, Convocations—not a word was uttered by any of them about the New Version.‡ James, before he became actual King, had indeed given order for the nomination of translators ; but after the Version was made, he took no steps whatever about it. That he was paid for the monopoly of printing it is probable ; that he did not contribute a farthing towards the expenses, is certain. The Bishops' Version, though authorized, had not become popular ; the so-called Royal Version was universally received without authority. The Genevan Version was not, however, displaced at once ; nine editions appeared in seven years after 1611, and it continued to be printed at intervals (sometimes by the King's printer *cum privilegio regiae majestatis*) until 1644, and possibly much later. When we consider the number of copies already in circulation, and this continued multiplication of them, we see how erroneous it is to suppose that the New Version at once superseded all others. Ultimately, however, it triumphed, like Jerome's, by its merit.§

A new revision made with similar care and such learning as

* What is still more curious, two of the three passages are still read in churches (Ps. cv. 28 ; civ. 30). There is sufficient ground for calling the Genevan the *current* version. From the first issue of the Bishops' Bible in 1568 to 1608, there were but twenty-nine editions of it issued ; while of other Bibles and Testaments, chiefly Genevan, there were 100. From 1608 again to 1611 only three out of thirty-two editions were of the Authorized Version. See Anderson's

"Annals of the English Bible."

† "Annals of the English Bible," by Rev. Christopher Anderson.

‡ Former versions had been authorized by proclamations and by canons.

§ Not perhaps by its merit alone. The Genevan Bible had the incumbrance of notes ; and moreover the importation or sale of the foreign editions was made a High Commission crime, under Laud. Under Cromwell measures were taken by Parliament for a revision, but political troubles interfered.

could now be brought to bear upon it, would win its way likewise. Nay, we indulge the hope that its execution would be such as to secure still more rapidly its general acceptance. Our obligation, however, is not affected by the anticipated conduct of others. Whether they refuse or whether they accept our work, it is our plain duty to make the people's Bible as perfect as human labour, with the help of God, can make it. We should indeed be sorry if that perfection were purchased at the expense of our early admiration and affection for the English Bible. But our affection is too strong to be shaken by the removal of the faults to which we cannot be blind, nor is our admiration so unreasoning that we should wish to sacrifice to it the purity of God's Word. Let it be granted, however, that the English Bible is not only the noblest monument of the language, but the stronghold of it; still, it must be remembered that this character did not originate with the last version, but was preserved through it, as it had been through those which preceded. What was then done merely out of respect for old associations will now be done partly also out of a wise estimation of the language itself. No scholar would willingly permit that beautiful and simple language to be cast aside; happily, every scholar knows that its preservation is not merely consistent with, but favours the utmost faithfulness to the original. Those who are not scholars may satisfy themselves that it is likely to be preserved, by tracing the past history of a few chapters from the first edition of Tyndale, through his second and all subsequent revisions.* It is surprising, indeed, how often we can render our translation perfectly faithful, adopting the phraseology of the older versions. In general it may be said, that the slight changes necessary to render our version all but perfect, while most of them would pass unnoticed by the ordinary reader, would be received gratefully by the real student. For how could the restoration of the genuine Word of God fail to add to the beauty and clearness and truth of any passage! "And what is the worth of one passage

* Bagster's "Hexapla" may be consulted for some of these. Tyndale's *first* edition and Coverdale's Bible have been reprinted separately by the same publisher, and will well repay the trouble of consulting them.

found out [says an old translator] is well understood of them who in the Scriptures thinke to have eternall life; everie passage is a new Virginia to dwell." Even where there is no positive error, it may be desirable to prevent misconceptions by introducing some unambiguous expression. Some experience of the mistakes most usual would point out the passages where such alteration may be necessary; without such experience they would probably be overlooked. Such a phrase, for instance, as "The lord commended the unjust steward," does in fact perplex many readers; yet it might not have occurred to the scholar to alter it.* The grammarian, again, would perhaps find no fault with the rendering of Rev. xiv. 13:—"Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth: Yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours; and their works do *follow* them." In fact, among the meanings of 'follow' given by Richardson is—"to accompany or attend upon, in the *suit* of,' and that this is the sense of the text is decided by a glance at the Greek *ἀκολουθεῖ μετ' αὐτῶν*, 'follow *with* them.' What shall we say, then, to the following comment proceeding from a Bishop and ex-Professor of Divinity? "THEIR WORKS DO FOLLOW THEM—mark that expression; it is one on which our dear departed friend doubtless may have frequently addressed you, and he told you that, when the believer stands before the Throne of God in the presence of his Saviour, he stands there divested of his works—they are not with him—he has no works but the Redeemer's works, nothing to trust in but the righteousness of Christ [true, certainly], and therefore it is said they do not accompany him, but follow him." Verily it is time to amend our version when it leads men of the highest standing in the Church thus to preach unscriptural doctrine. Nor is this a singular case. Even while I write, an instance has occurred of a similar mistake. An eminent clergyman has in a published essay adduced the text: "Make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness," as if it meant "Make the unrighteous your friends." A competent knowledge either of Greek or of English would have saved him from such an error; but this is too much to expect from

* The substitution of 'his lord' would prevent all misconception.

ordinary writers; and how much more from preachers. How often have we been told, on the authority of St. Peter, that St. Paul's Epistles contained things "hard to be understood, which the unlearned and unstable wrest to their own destruction"? Yet, in the English the reference of the pronoun 'which' ("in which are things hard," &c.) is ambiguous; and a reference to the Greek shows that the antecedent cannot be the 'epistles,' but must be 'these things;' and St. Paul is appealed to as treating of these perplexing subjects with inspired wisdom, as throwing light on difficulties, not as creating them.* It is needless to cite further instances of this class. These are enough to show that when the English words are even slightly ambiguous, thus actually calling for an appeal to the originals, respectable scholars adopt, without inquiry, the wrong meaning; and this even in important passages. Yet we are seriously asked to trust to the pulpit for the rectification of all errors. Most inadequate would pulpit criticism be at the best; but, as it is, we are compelled to say, that as long as the English text is in any degree incorrect or ambiguous, it is vain to expect better instruction from preacher, prelate, or professor.

As to obsolete expressions and Hebraisms, little need be said. There are very few archaisms which really perplex or mislead the reader. One such, however, is very frequent,—we mean the use of 'of,' in the sense of 'by,' of which an example has just been quoted. In one remarkable passage, too, the sense is obscured by a vulgarism in the use of 'by.' "I know nothing by myself," i. e., *against* myself. In fact, both as to archaisms and Orientalisms, those which seem the plainest have most need to be changed: they convey some idea to the reader certainly, but it is often a wrong one. Such a Hebraism, for example, as "cleanness of teeth" for famine, few would wish to change; but an apparently simple one, "leading captivity captive," has misled even translators and commentators on the New Testament. The use of "hell" for

* I am aware that Lachmann reads *alg.* But, without considering the evidence for either reading, it is plain that the argument rests on the fact of *oīq* being in the received text.

Hades, or 'the Unseen,' may perhaps be reckoned an archaism; and it is not easy to see why our translators (after the Genevan) should have altered it in one place, and one only (1 Cor. xv. 55). The word now stands in the New Testament ten times for 'the unseen;' once for Tartarus, the place of the fallen angels (2 Pet. ii. 4); and ten times for Gehenna, or the valley of Hinnom. In the Old Testament it represents only one word, namely, 'Sheol,' the same as Hades. Whatever rendering be adopted for Hades, 'hell' is obviously inadmissible; and whether 'Gehenna' itself should be preserved, deserves consideration.

I shall proceed to adduce a few instances of positive errors in our present Version; and the first will illustrate the vast importance of apparently slight changes. Mr. Wilson has shown very clearly that our Saviour was condemned,* not for claiming to be the Messiah, but for blaspheming in claiming to be in an exclusive sense *the* Son of God. One of the most remarkable passages supporting this view is John, v. 18:—"The Jews sought to slay Him, because he not only broke [not, had broken] the Sabbath, but also called God His own Father, making Himself equal to God." Here the most important word, 'own,' is altogether omitted in our Version. So far, indeed, have the translators been from intruding the doctrine of Christ's Divinity into passages where it is not alluded to, that they have not given the full force of some of the most explicit statements, as, for example, Tit. ii. 13:—"Looking for the blessed hope and appearing of the glory [not, glorious appearing] of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ," &c.; better perhaps, "the great God, even our Saviour."† It may be observed that we have omitted (as Coverdale has done) the article before "appearing," "blessed" applying to it as well as as to "hope," which here stands for the object of hope. Eph. v. 5, again, ought to read—"the kingdom of Christ and God," the second *of* having been inserted from inattention to the use of the Greek article. Instances of similar inattention are very frequent: one notable case I have already cited from 1 Tim. vi. 5; and an-

* "Illustrations of the method of explaining the New Testament," &c.

† See Mr. Ellicott's Commentary for a clear statement of the ground of this rendering.

other occurs in the same chapter:—"Let those who have believing masters not despise them, because they are brethren; but let them the rather serve them, because believing and beloved are they who receive the benefit." In these two cases the article determines the subject of the proposition; in the following from Heb. ix. 11, 12, its use in defining will appear from the translation:—"But Christ having come a high priest of the future* good things (*future* before his coming) through the greater and more perfect tabernacle,—hath entered once for all into the holiest," &c. A more important passage, perhaps, because more likely to mislead the ignorant, is 1 Pet. iii. 1, "that by the conversation [behaviour] of their wives without discussion they may be gained," not, "without *the word*." In the 15th verse of the chapter of Hebrews just quoted, the argument is injured partly by the insertion of the article:—"And for this reason he is mediator of a new covenant, in order that when death had taken place for [the] redemption of the transgressions under the first covenant, those who have been called to the eternal inheritance should receive the promise." Of the alterations here made in this passage three are necessitated by the force of the article; in the construction of the last clause I do not charge the Authorized Version with absolute error, but at least the rendering adopted is more probable. As to the word "covenant," it is, I think, clearly the only one which suits the whole context; but whatever be the word used, it must be preserved all through, as Tyndale has preserved "testament."† In another passage in Heb. vii. 18, 19, the insertion of the article is combined with neglect of the force of $\mu\epsilon\nu$ — $\delta\epsilon$:—There is "a

* Ebrard adopts the reading $\gamma\epsilon\nu\mu\epsilon\nu\omega\nu$.

† The argument commonly relied on for the rendering 'testament' is that in ver. 1 6, the death $\tau\omega\nu\ \delta\iota\alpha\theta\epsilon\mu\epsilon\nu\nu$ is said to be necessary; this seems not true of the "covenanting party," therefore the word must mean 'testator,' in which case the proposition is true. True, certainly, apart from the context, which shows it to be not only false, but impossible; for, not to mention that a testator cannot be called the *mediator* of his testament, in the Old Testament where was the death of the testator? The idea is, in fact, utterly inapplicable to the Apostle's argument. A recent voluminous writer on Biblical criticism, nevertheless, coolly assumes that 'testament' must be right.

putting away [why use such a word as *disannulling*?] of the commandment going before, on account of its weakness and unprofitableness (for the law made nothing perfect), and a bringing in of a better hope, &c."

Often the proper signification of the Greek moods and tenses is lost in the present Version. For example, Gal. v. 3, 4:—"I testify to every man who *is submitting* to circumcision [by no means, *who is circumcised*] that he is a debtor to do the whole Law. Ye have been *annulled* [or *made void*, as Wycliffe; it is the same as in Rom. vii. 6, is translated, "We are *delivered from*"] from Christ, ye that *are obtaining* justification [i. e. seeking to obtain] in the law." Again, Gal. i. 11:—"I resisted him [Peter], because he was condemned" (viz. by his own previous conduct). Similarly, in Acts, ii. 47:—"The Lord added together* those that were put in a state of salvation day by day" ("Those that *weren made saaf*"—Wycliffe).

Not to multiply examples, as might easily be done, I shall cite one or two illustrations of a different kind of fault,—the erroneous rendering of single words. And first, an unnecessary variation in rendering the same word in the same passage may obscure the connexion. Thus, Rom. xv. 4, 5:—"That we through the patience and comfort of the Scriptures may have hope. Now the God of this patience and comfort give you," &c. And in the same chapter, 12, 13:—"In him shall the Gentiles *hope*. Now the God of hope fill you," &c. Why $\epsilon\lambda\pi\eta\zeta\omega$ has been translated "trust" (after Tyndale) is not clear, unless it were suggested by the construction with $\epsilon\nu$. It has, however, been so rendered in 1 Tim. vi. 17, again:—"Not to have their *hope* fixed on the *uncertainty of riches*."[†] Other instances have already occurred. The converse error of not attending to the differences of words in the original is not less frequent. For example, Phil. iii. 11, *seq.* :—"If by any means I may attain unto the resurrection from the dead; not that I have already *gotten* [referring to verse 9], or am already completed, but I pursue, if I may also lay hold on that for

* We adopt the reading of the chief critical texts.

† In Heb. x. 23, where Tyndale is right:—"Let us kepe the profession of our hope | with-oute waveringe," *faith* may, perhaps, be a typographical error.

which I was also laid hold of by Christ." The reader of the common Version here could not avoid supposing the Apostle's meaning to be that he had not attained to the resurrection, implying apparently some mysterious attainment possible in this life.* Again, the use of the word "perfect," instead of 'completed,' or 'perfected,' gives an appearance of inconsistency with ver. 15. Another instance of apparent inconsistency from a similar cause occurs in Gal. vi. 2, 5,—"Bear one another's burdens;"—"Each shall bear his own *load*" (not *burden*), where there is an obvious distinction, as the connexion shows, between those burdens which one *can* bear for another, and those which *cannot* be shared. One other instance, 1 Cor. i. 18, 21:—"The doctrine† of the cross is to those that are perishing folly; but to us who are in the way of salvation it is the power of God.—God was pleased by the folly of the preaching [i. e. of the matter preached, the proclamation], to save those that believe." The common rendering would suggest to most readers a reflection on foolish preaching. But the word *κήρυγμα* can only mean the thing proclaimed; the rendering 'proclamation' will be found to throw light on all the passages where it occurs. For instance, Tit. i. 3:—"Manifested His Word in the proclamation with which I was intrusted."

It is a pity that we cannot more frequently preserve the relation of paronymous words, such as *ψυχή*, *ψυχικός*,‡ in 1 Cor. xv. 44, 45:—"If there exists an animal body, there exists also a spiritual. Thus also it is written: The first man Adam became an animal life: the last Adam a life-giving spirit." In the Book of Genesis, indeed, we read that the "man became a *living soul*." But the Hebrew words thus translated were, within the compass of a few verses, rendered "life" (ch. i. 30); "living creature" (i. 21, 24; ii. 19); "creature that hath life" (20); so that no distinguishing

* The error crept in through Tyndale's *second* edition. The *first* is not wrong.

† *Λόγος* and *κήρυγμα* occur together again in ch. ii. 4:—"My discourse and my proclamation;" and again in Titus, i. 3, as in the text. The word 'preach,' it may be observed, represents six or eight Greek words, differing in signification, and all variously translated—one 'to dispute,' 'to reason;' another, 'to show glad tidings,' &c. &c.

‡ Always opposed to *πνεῦμα*, spirit; and twice translated "sensual."

quality of man is referred to, as the English reader would probably suppose.

With respect to the variety in the rendering of the same word (which the translators defend in the Preface), it ought to be recognised that when the original author had not varied his expression, we are not justified in making any change for the sake of elegance alone. Further, as Lord Bacon well observes, where the original preserves a constant difference between two words (or modes of expression), he is a bad translator that confounds them;* and the converse is equally true, that he is a bad translator who uses indifferently two words of distinct meaning to represent the same word in the same sense in the original. Yet the cases in which this has been done in our Version are neither few nor unimportant. For example, the word *πρεσβύτερος*, usually rendered "bishop," is used in one passage (Acts, xx. 28; see ver. 17) in a manner which clearly establishes the identity of bishops and presbyters,† and the existence of several in one city. Yet the English reader cannot draw the legitimate conclusion, the word being rendered "overseers." It has been erroneously stated that this rendering was due to Bancroft's influence; the fact is, it occurs in Tyndale, who cannot be suspected of high prelaticeal notions. That variety in rendering the same words was often, even in important cases, the result of positive negligence, may be fairly inferred from the example already referred to (p. 18), in which, with the correct rendering ("God the Father") before them in every occurrence of the words, the translators have in two-thirds of the entire number of passages altered it to "the God and Father," or "God and the Father." Had they introduced the change in every instance, we could only charge them with error; but what shall we say to this self-condemning departure from their model?

What ideas, again, can be more distinct than judgment, condemnation, and damnation? That they are expressed by different

* The example he gives is the distinction of *πρεσβύτερος* and *ἱερεὺς*, which is preserved in our Version.

† The verb *πατερίω* occurs in connexion with *πρεσβύτερος*, also in 1 Pet. v. 2, being translated—"taking the oversight of."

Greek words no one will deny. Yet, what variation there is in the rendering of these and cognate words! The word generally translated "judge" (*κρινω*) is *once* rendered "damn" (2 Thess. ii. 12). In the Gospels it is always "judge," except in John, iii. 17, 18:—"God sent not His Son into the world in order to condemn [judge] the world," &c. The corresponding noun, *κριμα* (judgment, sentence), is the original of "damnation," in Rom. iii. 8—"whose damnation is just;" and in Rom. xiii. 2,—"They that resist shall receive damnation." It must be observed, that this is the word used in Luke, xxiii. 40, and xxiv. 20, of the condemnation of our Lord; and in John, ix. 39, where our Lord says:—"For judgment am I come into this world." Is this variation necessary or desirable? Is it right, again, that we should retain as a stumbling-block for tender consciences the words:—"He that doubteth is damned if he eat"? (Rom. xiv. 23), where the word used is commonly* and rightly rendered "condemn." Lastly, is it fair to the English reader to render the same word by "judgment," "condemnation," "damnation," within the compass of seven verses? (John, v. 24-30). To take, again, a different example, what reader would suspect that "to save," "to heal," and "to make whole," represent the same Greek words, or that "to save souls," and "to save lives," stand for the same phrase in the original?† In Acts, iv. 9, 10, 12, the connexion is lost by the same word being rendered in the former verses, "made whole," in the latter, "saved." The word, when used in reference to disease, is in the Gospels rendered indifferently by the one and the other, and I know not why "saved" was thought inappropriate in the same sense here. I shall cite but one or two other instances of error in single words:—"Patience [or endurance] worketh [not experience, but *proof*, as an old translator has it, or] approval, and approval,

* Seventeen times out of nineteen. I here, once for all, acknowledge my obligations to Mr. Wigram's "Englishman's Greek Concordance," a work I should be glad to see in the hands of every Biblical student, learned or unlearned.

† The Greek word for "soul" is rendered variously "heart," "mind," "life," "soul." It may be remarked that there are six other words rendered "mind," and three, "life."

hope" (Rom. v. 4, 5). So the same and related words in 2 Cor. xiii. 3, 5-7, where the word rendered 'reprobate' means little more than 'without proof.' Compare ver. 7 (see App.) In Phil. iii. 21, again, St. Paul does not call our body 'vile,' but, by a remarkable term, 'the body of our humiliation.' For an allusion in 1 Tim. vi. 11, lost in our Version, see Appendix. The last important word I shall refer to is $\theta\epsilon\lambda\omega$, 'to will or desire,' often confounded with the auxiliary 'will,' rather through the ambiguity of the English word than from any fault of the translators. Its force has been lost thus in many passages:—"How often I desired to gather thy children as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye were not willing" (same word, 'desired not')—(Mat. xxiii. 37). "Our Saviour God, who desireth that all men should be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth"—(1 Tim. ii. 4).

It ought to be noticed that errors which do not mislead the common reader, the literal signification of the English being plainly inappropriate, may tend to foster a loose system of interpretation. To illustrate this, I shall cite but two or three passages:—"He that loveth another hath fulfilled the law." "Then (when the Lord will make manifest the counsels of the heart), shall every man have praise of God." That these passages must be understood with great limitation seems clear to every one, and, if so, then why not other passages? Now, if the Greek article had been attended to in the translation, it would be seen that no limitation whatever was required or intended. "He that loveth his neighbour hath fulfilled the law." "Then shall each obtain the praise he deserves." Another well-known passage occurs to me, where the wrong insertion of the article gives us the statement that "the love of money is the root of all evil," while the Apostle calls it *a* root of all evil. And again:—"The Spirit will guide you to all the truth;" not to all truth, but to all that belongs to Christ's religion. To this head we may, perhaps, refer the erroneous rendering,—"*Take no thought for the morrow*" (Mat. v. 34, &c.), where the original word means, 'Be not anxious' or 'distracted.' The words might, however, mislead some tender consciences.

I have not space to enter at any length into the errors in the translation of the Old Testament. Gross mistakes are, as might be expected, more numerous than in the New Testament, while in general the rendering is closer and more literal. I shall quote only one or two passages, being the first that come to my hands, and which happen to be chiefly from the Book of Proverbs. Thus, in chap. viii. 35, 36, the antithesis is lost—"Whoso findeth me findeth life, but he that misseth me harmeth his life," &c. In chap. xix. 18, we ought to read—"Chasten thy son while there is hope; but let not thy soul be lifted up to slay him,"—a warning against excessive chastisement. In the preceding chapter (xviii. 8)—"The words of a talebearer," saith the wise man, "are as dainty morsels [by no means *as wounds*], and go down into the innermost parts of the belly." They are tidbits greedily swallowed; so also chap. xxvi. 22. What a weighty saying is lost in chap. xxvii. 6:—"Faithful are the wounds of a friend [of a lover], and abundant the kisses of an enemy [a hater]." The second clause is parallel to the saying in verse 14:—"He that blesseth [greeteth] his friend with a loud voice, early in the morning, it shall be counted a curse to him." The passage, chap. xxv. 23, referred to in Lieutenant Maury's recent work, as showing the quarter from which rain comes in Palestine, is, unfortunately for his argument, mistranslated:—"The north wind bringeth a shower [not constant rain], and an angry countenance a secret tongue." It is easy to see what led to the error in this verse. To cite passages, from the Prophets especially, which are either misunderstood or not understood at all in our Version, would be tedious, and not very interesting. A few instances may, however, be given from other books. In Psalm cxli. 5, what can be understood by oil not breaking the head? The word rendered "break" means 'to refuse':—"Oil for the head my head will not refuse." In the Third Commandment, again, of the Decalogue is it not generally supposed that profane swearing is forbidden? and this, although the marginal references and our Lord's express statement (Matt. v. 33) show that the word 'vain' here means 'a lie,' the law being against false swearing. 'Vain' and 'vanity,' which are often used in this sense in the Old Testament, were, of course,

suggested by the Latin. This instance may seem trivial; but it has a very important bearing.

One or two instances from passages in Genesis, obscure to the English reader, may be interesting. Gen. iv. 23, Lamech says:—"I have slain a man for my wounding [i.e. for wounding me], and a young man for my hurt." In vi. 3, where the word rendered "strive" can only be explained by kindred words in Hebrew and Arabic, the most probable rendering is—"My spirit shall not always dwell [or, perhaps, rule] in man, because of their transgressions; he is flesh, yet his days," &c. I observe the word "strive with" in this passage used as the basis of an argument in Mr. Williams's late pamphlet against Mr. Maurice, and the latter in his reply does not notice the circumstance that this rendering is at best questionable. The older versions—the Septuagint, the Vulgate, Syriac, and Arabic—have "dwell" or "remain." Again, in chap. iii. 22, the rendering adopted by Mr. Preston seems to commend itself:—"The man is [or was] as one of us, in distinguishing good and evil; but now [that he has chosen the evil], he must not be permitted to put forth his hand," &c. It was not by an act of sin that man became like to God, but he was made so in the freedom of his will to choose good or evil.

It would be easy to multiply such examples, but these are sufficient for our purpose. Yet they do not give an adequate idea of the revision required. I have of course selected a few of the most obvious errors; but it would be impossible to show by citation of detached verses the effect of what would appear to be minor errors in obscuring an argument. To the reader of the original, references would be superfluous. Suffice it to say, that in almost every page there will be found various deviations from strict accuracy; and without such accuracy it is plain that the closest reasoning may be involved in deep perplexity.* A revision which should remove all unnecessary difficulties, correct such errors as have been pointed out, and put the English reader, as far as can be, in possession of the very words of the inspired writers, and which should do this

* For the correction of such errors it is obvious that occasional criticism is altogether useless.

without impairing the beauty of the English Bible, would be a glorious work. It is marvellous that in a Protestant, a Bible-loving, a Bible-diffusing country, such a work needs to be defended. It is natural, doubtless, that men who are not familiar with the processes and results of criticism should feel alarm about operations of which they know nothing, carried on by persons in whom they have no confidence. But that those who ought to be better informed, should denounce all attempts to make the people's Bible a more perfect substitute for the original, seems quite unaccountable. I would earnestly call upon them to consider the question solemnly as one of positive duty. Excellent as our Version is compared with others, there are in it "inaccuracies not less patent than remediable,"—there are "misrepresentations of the language of the Holy Ghost, and he who, after being satisfied in any degree of this, leans to counsels of obstructiveness, or who, if intellectually unable to test the truth, permits himself to denounce or deny them, deals deceitfully with the Word of God."* It is said, indeed, that the English Bible is sufficient for salvation, and, therefore, no change is required. I confess that I cannot see the connexion between the premiss and the conclusion. The New Testament alone, nay, a single Gospel, is, I suppose, sufficient for salvation; but is the rest, therefore, superfluous? and is all preaching unnecessary? Do not the Scriptures consist for the most part, not of what is essential to salvation, but of what is profitable for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness? To what purpose, in fine, is the assertion, unless it is maintained that when God has given a revelation to the Church she is at liberty to publish to her members so much as is thought necessary to salvation, and "reserve" the rest. The learned are, as it were, the interpreters who convey God's Word to the people; and the one duty of an interpreter is to be faithful. He is left no discretion to choose what may be communicated, what reserved; much less is he allowed to select what errors may be safely left in his interpretation. As

* Mr. Ellicott's Preface to *Pastoral Epistles*.

to what are termed slight errors, I cannot do better than refer to the excellent remarks of the late Archdeacon Hare:—

“ Nor should any error be deemed slight which affects the meaning of a single word in the Bible, where so much weight is attached to every single word, and where so many inferences and conclusions are drawn from the slightest grounds, not merely those which find utterance in books, but a far greater number springing up in the minds of the millions to whom our English Bible is the code and canon of all truth. For this reason errors, even the least, in a version of the Bible are of far greater moment than in any other book, as well because the contents of the Bible are of far deeper importance, and have a far wider influence, as also because the readers of the Bible are not only the educated and learned, who can exercise some sort of judgment on what they read, but vast multitudes who understand whatever they read according to the letter. Hence it is a main duty of a Church to take care that the version of the Scriptures, which it puts into the hands of its members, shall be as faultless as possible, and to revise it with this view from time to time, in order to attain the utmost accuracy in every word.”*

Nevertheless I am sorry to be obliged to agree with Mr. Ellicott, that for any *authoritative* revision we are not yet mature. Not that the preliminary settlement of the primitive text is an insuperable obstacle. Biblical criticism has not degenerated as Dr. Cumming affirms;—that it is lamentably neglected no reader of his Lecture will deny; its progress has been retarded by bitter opposition; but the most superficial student of the subject knows that its origin, as a science, is quite recent.† Dr. Cumming and

* “ *Mission of the Comforter*,” p. 392.

† Dr. Cumming refers, indeed, to Dr. Wordsworth in support of his assertion. Probably his knowledge of Dr. Wordsworth’s edition of the Gospels extends little beyond the Preface, in which he found a reference to an illustration of the degeneracy of modern (German) criticism, occurring in pp. 250, 251. Had he taken the pains to read, he would have discovered that Dr. Wordsworth spoke of criticism of the narrative, not of the text. The mistake is the same in kind as if Mr. Collier’s work on the text of Shakespeare should be viewed as an attempt to estimate the historical value of “ King Henry VII.”

others regret the loss of the Apostles' autographs (although, if they existed, their genuineness and purity would certainly not be evident); yet those who seek to restore the text contained in them are regarded as enemies of the Bible. When they cannot be charged with giving judgment against evidence, they are yet spoken of as *attacking* this or that reading. They are told, at their peril, that they must *find* our present readings in the ancient manuscripts. How touching the words of Bengel, a man who nobly devoted his whole powers to the illustration of the Scriptures, and was in consequence charged with unparalleled audacity:—"Oh! that this may be the last occasion of my standing in the breach to vindicate the precious original text of the New Testament!"* "Though the received text," said he, "as it is, contains the Word of God, on which my soul may rest as safely as on heaven's foundation, still there are many precious gems buried in the great hoard of criticism by those who have gone before me, and such valuables I feel it my duty to bring out to the sight of all, that no one, if possible, may be ignorant of their real worth."†

What a contrast to the flippant language of Dr. Cumming, who, "after three months' study," has come to the conclusion that all the "suggested improvements" of critics are "mere trifles and bagatelles, not worth listening to." The learned orator has yet to learn, apparently, that "various readings" are not improvements suggested by critics, or "supposed to be more in accordance with the meaning of the sacred writers."‡ Is it necessary to repeat that critics have not written the manuscripts; that their only function is to compare the evidence, and accept as genuine whatever on the whole has the balance in its favour; and this will plainly be the 'duty of revisers in every case,' whether the result be one of certainty or probability. Of course, in such questions there will be variety of judgment. Shall we then refuse to alter Stephens's text unless we have the unanimous judgment of critics, however

* Memoir by Burk, Eng. trans., p. 245.

† Ib., p. 426.

‡ Whether these words were reported verbatim or not, is of little consequence. Statements essentially the same have been perpetually repeated. I cite Dr. Cumming merely as the most prominent advocate of such views.

qualified, in favour of some one reading? We might as fairly require the testimony of MSS. to be unanimous. The question is not between the judgment of ancient critics and of modern; it is between the result of collation of a few not remarkably good copies, and that of hundreds of copies including the best authorities. Dr. Cumming, and others who follow the 'Protestant Pope Stephens,' finding it easy to show that critics are not unanimous, adopt a principle very like the Romish doctrine of Probability. In every case where the reading is disputed they search for some critic who has supported the vulgar text, and their conclusion is then quite triumphant:—"This may safely be taken and taught as the Word of God, and we may leave our disciples ignorant that any doubt whatever rests upon it." Nay, the conclusion is the same if the Vulgar Text is rejected by all critics, provided they differ as to the true reading. I ask seriously, is this to deal faithfully with the Word of God? or is it consistent with our duty, when the true Inspired Word is in question, to adopt the sceptic's argument, and say: First let the critics settle their differences, and then we will listen to them? We cannot persuade ourselves to think so; we feel too deep an interest in the exact words of the sacred writers to think any critical evidence negligible; and, as far as our knowledge goes, we would have all made partakers of it, giving always in the text the best supported reading. Such, for example, are the following, bearing on one great doctrine:—"Sanctify the Lord *Christ* in your hearts;"* "Pray the *Lord* if perchance the thought of thy heart may be forgiven thee;"† "They essayed to go into Bithynia, and the Spirit of *Jesus* suffered them not."‡ But we must often be satisfied with probable evidence; nor can we agree with Mr. Malan, that "nothing but proof positive can justify the choice of one reading and the rejection of another." "We shall," he adds in reference to disputed passages, "be sooner excused for believing a thing ignorantly from a devout feeling on our part, rather than for discrediting what, after all, we ought to have believed from any private feel- .

* 1 Pet. iii. 15. See Isa. viii. 13, 14. † Acts, viii. 22. ‡ Acts, xvi. 9.

ing of our own on the subject." Surely. But the question is, whether we shall be sooner excused for knowingly misleading the unlearned, or for conscientiously following the evidence before us. It seems to me that adding to the Word of God is as perilous a proceeding as taking from it. Copyists have always thought otherwise, and hence the frequent insertion of spurious words or even clauses. But with respect to the text specified by Mr. Malan (1 John, v. 7), who can plead ignorance? If the evidence against it be plain and positive, let us not dare to put it forth as divine; if the proof of its spuriousness be not decisive, but probable, let the doubt be intimated to the reader, as was done with regard to this very text in Coverdale's, Matthew's, and Cranmer's Bibles, and as is done to this day in our Authorized Version with respect to a clause now not in any degree doubtful, in the succeeding chapter (1 John, vi. 23). Here, as elsewhere, our translators have taught us how to escape the difficulty of deciding finally between two readings. With equal judgment and honesty they placed in the text what seemed to them the most probable reading, and if any other was thought deserving of notice, it was given in the margin. They had, however, but scanty means of knowing or judging of the variations in the ancient witnesses; but if, with the critical collections now in our hands, or shortly to be published, the same principle be adopted, there will never again be any necessity for a violent change. Future researches may slightly affect the balance of evidence in a few cases: they may make the marginal more probable than the textual reading; but there will be no chance that a reading not now noticed shall ever establish its superiority to those admitted.

I think, therefore, that while a systematic collation of important documents is much to be desired, the want of it is not a decisive objection to a revision. A much more serious difficulty is the state of Biblical scholarship amongst us. It is strange that any able writer, even sixty years ago, should maintain that the Apostle Paul wrote Greek of such a quality that the only clue to his meaning was a knowledge of what he ought to say; it is stronger that a translation, executed on such principles, should

have been long regarded as a high authority. But it is still more surprising to find eminent scholars of the present day infected with the same notion. When the most renowned lexicographers and grammarians would have us believe that *ὅτι* means *therefore*, or *in order that*; that *καὶ* means *and*, and *ἐν*, *ex*,—what can be looked for from the mass of self-constituted critics? Only the other day a distinguished scholar (and translator of St. Paul) appealed to Phil. iii. 12, as a proof that the perfect and aorist were indiscriminately used in the New Testament dialect.* That text furnishes, in reality, a striking instance of their exact discrimination.

We have, doubtless, as good Greek scholarship in England as anywhere, but it has been hitherto almost entirely confined to the illustration of the dramatists. Editors of *Æschylus* and of Aristotle are fond of representing their works as material to aid the study of the Greek Testament, and rightly so; but it seems not to have occurred to them that, while every one was engaged in adding to the vast mass of materials, the structure itself was wholly neglected. It is a fact that in the middle of the nineteenth century we are still in want of a good Lexicon to the New Testament. Now, at last, scholars have turned their attention to the subject. We are promised lexicons, and we already possess commentaries by Mr. Alford, Mr. Ellicott, and others, which will not suffer by comparison with those of any age or country. The long-neglected study of Hebrew, also, is beginning to revive; but as yet the greatest works of Hebrew learning come from Germany. We have not a sufficient number of *professed* scholars to afford scope for the selection of revisers in whom the public would have confidence, nor have we a learned public capable of estimating scholarship, or testing its results. How, then, is England to obtain

* I may be permitted to quote Dr. Wordsworth's words as expressing views to which the ablest scholars would now pretty generally assent:—"The Greek of the New Testament is not the Greek of Xenophon, Plato, or Demosthenes. It is a language of its own. And we need not scruple to affirm that, in precision of expression, in pure and native simplicity, in delicacy of handling, in the grouping of words and phrases, in dignified and majestic simplicity, it has no rival in the world."—*Preface to the Gospels*.

that "company of wise and cunning craftsmen into whose hands she may hopefully confide her jewel of most precious price?" Mr. Ellicott answers judiciously,—By encouraging small bands of scholars to make independent efforts on separate books, by their failures to learn wisdom, out of their censors to secure coadjutors, and by their partial success to win over the prejudiced and gainsaying. I would add, also, by promoting the general study of the original texts. Those who have not yet obtained entrance into that fruitful field cannot more profitably employ their leisure hours than in qualifying themselves for the enjoyment of its fresh and pleasant flowers; those who have already acquired the original tongues, and who are engaged in public teaching, will be driven by very shame to consult the volumes which ought to have been their daily companions; a higher standard of scholarship will be set up and by some attained; and in a few years we shall have an incomparable body of Biblical students, and a public competent to judge of the fitness and of the success of those who may be selected for the great task of revision. In the meantime, let every sincere attempt to set forward the work be received gratefully, and with favour proportioned to its real merits; not harshly and unkindly criticised because it falls short of that perfection which can only be expected from a final combined effort. Harsh criticism, however, all labourers must be prepared to meet. There is a class of persons who seem to believe that changes are proposed independently of all evidence, and are to be judged of solely by subjective feeling. These persons of course take for granted that if a committee of revision be appointed, it will be selected from "the most learned men of all denominations,"—the most learned Mormon, the most learned Glasite, the most learned Southcotian, &c., and that the predominant sect will intrude its own opinions into the Bible. Learning, judgment, love of truth, or piety, are not to be trusted in a sacred book with the application of the rules of grammar or the laws of language. There could be no more bitter satire on the too frequent perversion of the judgment in theological matters; but we do not believe it to be true.

The most painful instance of this banishment of evidence and

reason in deference to subjective feeling has occurred with respect to a translation of the Book of Job, published by a well-known American Hebraist.

In this version the passage, chap. xix. 26, is so rendered as not to express the doctrine of the resurrection of the body. Forthwith a popular writer and speaker, without pretending to judge that the rendering is inconsistent with the original, holds up the translator to reprobation in a public lecture, as one who so translates because he wishes to set aside entirely the doctrine of the resurrection. The ignorant are left to infer, that the orator's belief in the doctrine depends wholly on the saying of the illustrious but uninspired patriarch. We may charitably suppose that Dr. Cumming believed at least that all scholars were unanimous in favour of the common interpretation; but had he looked even so cursorily into the evidence before making so grave a charge against a brother Christian, he would have learned that all believers in the resurrection do not feel bound to *find* a similar belief in the words of Job. One name alone would be defence enough, if any defence but the Hebrew text were needed, that of the pious and learned Bengel; but I prefer appealing to Albert Barnes, whose Commentary on Job is pronounced, by unimpeachable authority, one "in all respects worthy of a good scholar and a sound divine."* How, then, does Mr. Barnes translate the passage?—"For I know that my Avenger liveth, and that hereafter He shall stand upon the earth. And though after my skin this [flesh] shall be destroyed, yet even without my flesh shall I see God." "The opinion," he adds, "that the passage refers to the Redeemer and to the resurrection is sustained more by feelings of piety than by solid argument and exegesis." Though pained at the conclusion to which he is brought, he is forced to admit that "all that is fairly implied in the passage is fully met by the events recorded in the close of the book." Consistency would oblige Dr. Cumming to charge Mr. Barnes with setting aside entirely the doctrine of the resurrection; but in this case it has yielded, I am happy

* Editor's Preface.

to say, to his charity. He is so far from excommunicating Mr. Barnes, that he has reprinted this very work with the sanction, "Edited by John Cumming, D. D., " on the title-page. He stamps the whole work with his approval in the words above cited, adding that he is "confident that it will do more to bring out the beauties, force, and application of this patriarchal work, than any other attempt at explaining the Book of Job." I leave my readers to comment on this curious specimen of consistent criticism. We are reminded of the monk of the fifteenth century, who told his hearers that two new languages, Hebrew and Greek, had been invented, and every one who learned them became either a Jew or a Pagan. So we are now told that a number of MSS. and grammars have been invented, but no good Christian pays them any heed. Hebrew and Greek have, however, long since reached their rightful position, and so ere long will Biblical grammar and criticism. A revision will be made, but it is of the greatest moment that it should fall into the hands of those who know how to reverence our present Version. Yet these are the very persons who are discouraged by ill-judged opposition. Let all lovers of truth and of God's Word cheer on every able workman, that he may labour to "repair the old edifice with stones as near as can be of the same colour, well fitted in, with due regard to the fine tracery and good proportions of the original pile. So may others admire and ask to be admitted to the work of improvement, and to become partners in the solemn task of revising a version of Scripture so venerable, so faithful, and so true,—which ought to be one and the same for all who speak the language in which it is written."*

To conclude, we call for a revision in the name of the millions who are wholly dependent on the English Version; and in the name of the thousands who, though not so dependent, must be often misled by their familiarity with it; we call for it in the name of posterity, with whose highest interests we are, ~~so~~ far, intrusted; we call for it in the name of the laity, that they may

* Rev. S. C. Malan's "Defence of the Authorized Version."

not be dependent on the ignorance of their priests ; in the name of the clergy, also, that they may be saved, on the one side, from teaching error, and, on the other, from causing needless offence to the prejudices of their people by teaching the truth. To timid objectors we would say—If you have any faith in an active Providence, if you believe that God has not left His Word hitherto, and will not leave it to the mercy of its enemies ; if you believe that Divine assistance is given when sought in faith ; do not hold back from this work doubting of His power or His will. To more active, but less excusable opponents, we say—If this work be of God, as it assuredly is, take heed lest ye be found to fight against God. Beware lest ye sacrifice truth to feeling, or duty to apparent difficulty. If you are not qualified to assist in the work, do not on that account stir up the prejudices of the ignorant and unlearned against it. One writer of this class has adopted, as his principle, “Hold fast that ye have.”* I shall conclude with the recommendation of a higher authority (because not misapplied) :—“Put all to the proof ; hold fast that which is good.”

* See Rev. ii. 25, and iii. 11.

APPENDIX.

A LIST OF SOME OF THE MOST IMPORTANT WORDS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT, SHOWING TO WHAT GREEK WORD EACH CORRESPONDS IN EACH PASSAGE WHERE IT OCCURS, AND HOW THAT WORD IS RENDERED ELSEWHERE.

N. B.—It is not by any means implied that the same rendering can or ought to be adhered to in all these cases.

TO SAVE—SALVATION—SAVIOUR.

WITH three exceptions, the Greek verb rendered "TO SAVE" is always *σώζω* (*sōzō*). This word is in 2 Tim. iv. 18, rendered 'preserve,' elsewhere in the Epistles it is always 'save.' In the Gospels and Acts it is rendered 'heal' or 'make whole,' or, in the passive, 'be whole,' in the following passages:—Matt. ix. 21, 22; Mark, v. 23, 28, 34, vi. 56, x. 52; Luke, viii. 36, 48, 50, xvii. 19; Acts, iv. 9, xiv. 9. In John, xi. 12, it is 'do well;' in Acts, ii. 40, 'save yourselves;' the verb in these two cases being in the passive voice. 'To save' stands twice for *διασώζω* (*diasōzō*) (otherwise rendered 'heal,' 'make perfectly whole,' each once; 'escape,' 'bring safe'), viz., in Acts, xxvii. 43, and 1 Pet. iii. 20, and once only (2 Pet. ii. 5) for *φυλάσσω* (*phulasso*) (to 'keep,' 'observe,' 'beware').

'SAVING' as a substantive, in Heb. x. 89, stands for *περιποίησις* (*peripōēsis*), rendered elsewhere 'purchased possession' (Eph. i. 14); 'to obtain,' or 'to the obtaining' (1 Thess. v. 9, and 2 Thess. ii. 14); 'peculiar' (margin, 'purchased') (1 Pet. ii. 9). These are the only instances of its occurrence.

'SALVATION' stands always for *σωτηρία* (*sotēria*); *σωτηρίου* (*sotēriōn*), or *σωτήριος* (*sotērios*) (bringing a., once only). But *σωτηρία* is rendered 'health' (Acts, xxvii. 34); 'that we should be saved' (Luke, i. 71); 'saving' (Heb. xi. 7); and in Acts, vii. 26, 'would deliver' is in the original 'gives *σωτηρία*.' In all other instances this word is simply rendered 'Salvation,' as is *σωτήριον* in the four passages where it occurs, Luke, ii. 30, iii. 6; Acts, xxviii. 28; Eph. vi. 17.

'SAVIOUR' and *σωτήρ* (*sotér*) invariably correspond.

JUST—JUSTIFY—JUSTIFICATION—RIGHTEOUS—RIGHTEOUANESS, &c.

‘JUST’ is twice ἐνδίκος (*endikos*) (Rom. iii. 8; Heb. ii. 2); elsewhere δίκαιος (*dikaios*), and the adverb ‘JUSTLY’ is δίκαιῶς (*dikaios*). δίκαιος is, however, generally rendered ‘righteous,’ for which it is the *only word*. Twice it is ‘meet’ (Phil. i. 7; 2 Pet. i. 13); and five times ‘right’ (Matt. xx. 4, 7; xii. 57; Acts, iv. 19; Eph. vi. 1); δίκαιῶς is twice ‘justly,’ twice ‘righteously,’ and once (1 Cor. xv. 34) ‘to righteousness.’

‘To JUSTIFY’ is δικαιόω (*dikaioo*), which is always so translated except in Rev. xxii. 11, where it is (in the passive voice) ‘be righteous,’ and Rom. vi. 7 (‘be freed’).

‘JUSTIFICATION’ stands twice for δίκαιωσις (*dikaiosis*) (which does not elsewhere occur), viz., Rom. iv. 25, v. 18; once for δίκαιωμα (*dikaioma*) (Rom. v. 16). This last word, which properly implies an act of right doing, or, as in the passage referred to, a sentence of acquittal, is rendered ‘righteousness’ in the same chapter, ver. 18, also in viii. 4, and in ii. 26, where the word in the original is plural, as also in Rev. xix. 8. The plural is rendered ‘ordinances’ in Luke, i. 6, and Heb. ix. 1, 10. The same word is the original of ‘judgment’ in Rom. i. 32, and Rev. xv. 4.

‘RIGHTEOUS,’ as has been said, represents δίκαιος only.

‘RIGHTEOUANESS,’ except in the four passages mentioned, where the original has δίκαιωμα, always stands for δίκαιοσύνη (*dikaiosyne*), which is not otherwise translated.

Of the negatives ‘unrighteous,’ ‘unrighteousness,’ it is sufficient to observe that ἀδίκος (*adikos*) is the only word in the original both for ‘unjust’ and ‘unrighteous,’ except that the substantive ἀδίκία is twice translated adjectively ‘unjust,’ *lit.* ‘of injustice’ (Luke, xvi. 9, xviii. 6). This substantive is generally rendered ‘unrighteousness,’ but sometimes ‘iniquity,’ once ‘wrong’ (2 Cor. xii. 13). The usual word for ‘iniquity’ is ἀνομία (*anomia*), which is once rendered ‘unrighteousness,’ for the sake of an antithesis which is not in the Greek, viz., 2 Cor. vi. 14.

FAITH—BELIEVE—BELIEF, &c.

‘FAITH’ once stands for ἀλπίς (*elpis*), ‘hope’ (Heb. x. 23), elsewhere only for πίστις (*pistis*). πίστις is rendered ‘fidelity’ (Tit. i. 10); ‘assurance’ (Acts, xvii. 31); ‘belief’ (2 Thess. ii. 18); and ‘them that believe’ (Heb. x. 39).

‘FAITHFUL’ is πιστός (*pistos*), rendered ‘true’ (1 Tim. iii. 1); ‘sure’ (Acts, xiii. 34); ‘believer’ (1 Tim. iv. 12); and by the verb ‘believe,’ ‘believing,’ in John xx. 27; Acts, x. 45; 2 Cor. vi. 15; 1 Tim. iv. 3, 10, v. 16.

‘To BELIEVE,’ except in the cases about to be noticed, always represents

πιστεῖω (*pisteō*). It stands sometimes, as we have seen, for the adjective *πιστὸς*, or the substantive *πιστός*: three times (Acts, xvii. 4, xxvii. 11, xxviii. 24) the original has the passive of *πιθῶ* (*peitho*), a word generally rendered 'to persuade,' and in the passive 'to be persuaded,' also 'to yield,' 'agree to,' 'obey'; in 1 John iii. 19, it is 'assure.' The perfect middle is rendered (correctly) 'to trust,' 'have confidence,' 'be confident,' &c.*

In Luke, i. 1, the original of 'fully believed' is the passive of *πληροφορίω* (*plerophoreo*), ('to fulfil,' &c.,) rendered 'fully persuaded' (Rom. iv. 21, xiv. 5); 'fully known' (2 Tim. iv. 5); and in the active 'make full proof' (2 Tim. iv. 17). The corresponding substantive is rendered 'full assurance' (Col. ii. 2, '— of understanding'), (Heb. vi. 11, '— of hope'), (x. 22 '— of faith'), 'assurance' (1 Thess. i. 8). In all other cases the original of 'believe' is *πιστεύω*, which in the passive is sometimes rendered 'to be intrusted with,' 'to have committed to one.'

'UNBELIEF' stands for *ἀπιστία* (*apistia*) generally, but in Rom. xi. 30, 32, and Heb. iv. 6, 11, for *ἀπειθεία* (*apeithia*), rendered 'disobedience' in Eph. ii. 2, v. 6, and Col. iii. 6. The adjective *ἀπιστος* (*apistos*), corresponding to the former word, is rendered 'unbeliever,' 'faithless,' 'infidel,' 'incredible:' the verb (*ἀπιστῶ*) is always 'believe not.' The adjective *ἀπειθῆς* (*apeithēs*), corresponding to the other word, is always 'disobedient;' the verb is sometimes 'believe not,' but in the following passages is 'obey not,' or 'disobey,' viz., Rom. ii. 8, 21; 1 Pet. ii. 7, 8, iii. 1, 20, iv. 17.

JUDGE—JUDGMENT—CONDAMN—DAMN, &c.

'To JUDGE' generally corresponds to *κρίνω* (*kriño*). In 1 Cor. ii. 15, *twice*, iv. 3, *twice*, ver. 4, xiv. 24, it stands for *ἀνακρίνω* (*anakriño*), elsewhere rendered 'examine' (usually, e. g., Acts, xii. 19), 'discern' (1 Cor. ii. 14), 'search' (Acts, xvii. 11), 'ask questions' (1 Cor. x. 25, 27). In the same Epistle, ch. ii. 5, xi. 81, xiv. 29, the original is *διακρίνω* (*diakriño*), elsewhere 'discern' (e. g., 1 Cor. xi. 29), 'doubt' (in passive), or the like. In 1 Cor. vi. 2, the word is the substantive *κριτήριον* (*kritērion*). Elsewhere, with one exception (Heb. x. 29, *ηγέρουσι*), the verb is *κρίνω*. This word, having the same variety of meanings as 'Judge,' is of course very variously rendered (by fourteen words), as, 'think,' 'determine,' 'esteem' (Rom. xiv. 5, *twice*); in its more important and judicial signification it occurs in John, iii. 17, 18, *twice*; Acts, xiii. 27; Rom. xiv. 22,† in which passage it is rendered 'condemn'; 2 Thess. ii. 12, it is 'damn,' and in Rev. xviii. 20, 'avenge' (with *κρίμα*).

'JUDGMENT' is generally *κρίσις* (*krisis*), rendered also 'condemnation' (John, iii. 19, v. 24); 'accusation' (2 Pet. ii. 11); and 'damnation' (Matt. xxiii. 33;

* In the English Version 'to trust' stands ten times for this perfect, and sixteen times for *πιστῶ* (*peitho*) 'to hope.' These ten passages are: Matt. xxvii. 43; Mark, x. 24; Luke, xii. 33, xxviii. 9; 2 Cor. i. 9, x. 7; Phil. ii. 24, iii. 4; Heb. ii. 18, xiii. 18.

† In this chapter it occurs altogether eight times, with a threefold rendering.

Mark, iii. 29; John, v. 29) *Κρίμα* (*krima*) signifying, more strictly, the sentence (*κρίσις* being the act of *judging*), is the original of 'judgment' in Matt. vii. 2; John, ix. 89; Acts, xxiv. 25; Rom. ii. 2, 3, v. 16, xi. 33; Gal. v. 10; Heb. vi. 2; 1 Pet. iv. 17; 2 Pet. ii. 3; Rev. xvii. 1, xx. 4. It is rendered 'condemnation' or 'be condemned' in Luke, xxiii. 40, xxiv. 20; 1 Cor. xi. 84; 1 Tim. iii. 6; James, iii. 1; Jude, 4; and 'damn' in Matt. xxiii. 14; Mark, xii. 40; Luke, xx. 47; Rom. iii. 8, xiii. 2; 1 Cor. xi. 29; 1 Tim. v. 12. In Rev. xviii. 20, it is joined with *κρίνω* in translation. In 1 Cor. vi. 4, the original is *κριτήριον*, rendered by 'judge' in v. 2 ('unworthy of the least *κριτήρια*'), and 'judgment seat' in James, ii. 6.

'Judgment,' also, as was mentioned, stands twice for *δικαιώμα*, once for *δίκη* ('vengeance,' 'punish', Acts, xxv. 15,) and once for *ἡμέρα* ('day') 1 Cor. iv. 3.

'To CONDEMN,' in a judicial sense, is in the New Testament *κατακρίνω* (*katakrino*), rendered 'damn' in Mark, xvi. 16; Rom. xiv. 23; the corresponding substantives are 'condemnation' only, viz., *κατακρίσις* (*katakrisis*), in 2 Cor. iii. 9, vii. 3, *κατακρίμα* (*katakrima*) in Rom. v. 16, 18, viii. 1. 'To condemn' is sometimes (especially in an extra-judicial sense) *καταδικάζω* (*katadicazo*), Matt. xii. 7, 37; Luke, vi. 37, twice; James, v. 6; or *καταγινώσκω* (*kataginosko*), 1 John, iii. 20, 21; Gal. ii. 11. (The only occurrences of these words).

'DAMN' represents only *κρίνω* or *κατακρίνω*, already mentioned.

'DAMNATION,' besides the words already mentioned, stands in 2 Pet. ii. 1, twice, 3, iii. 16, for *ἀπωλεία* (*apoleia*), elsewhere rendered 'perdition,' 'destruction,' 'to die' (Acts, xxv. 16,) 'pernicious ways,' 'waste,' 'perish.'

HELL.

'HELL,' is *γέεννα* (*geenna*) in twelve passages, but in these ten *ἄδης* (*hades*) viz., Matt. xi. 28, xvi. 18; Luke, x. 15, xvi. 23; Acts, ii. 27, 31; Rev. i. 18, vi. 8, xx. 3. 'Αδης is once rendered 'grave' (1 Cor. xv. 55). In 2 Pet. ii. 4, the word is different (*ταραπώσας*).

WORLD—FOR EVER, &c.

'WORLD.'—We must distinguish—1. 'The world' simply; 2. 'This world.' 3. 'The world *to come*,' '*end of the world*,' &c.

1. 'The world,' simply, means this earthly world, the earth and its inhabitants. The Greek word generally so rendered is *κόσμος* (*kosmos*), (primarily 'order'). In fourteen passages, which need not be enumerated, the word is *οἰκουμένη* (*oikoumenē*) the 'inhabited,' once *γῆ* (*gē*) 'earth,' Rev. xiii. 8.

2. 'This world' may imply opposition to other supposed existing worlds, to heaven, &c., and then the original word is still *κόσμος*, viz., John, viii. 23, ix. 39, xi. 9, xii. 25, 31, xiii. 1, xiv. 30, xvi. 11, xviii. 36; 1 Cor. i. 20, iii. 19, v. 10, vii. 31; Eph. ii. 2; 1 John, iv. 17. In 1 Tim. vi. 7, 'this' is not in the original.

Or, 'this world' may mean 'the present order of things,' 'the present age,' 'dispensation,' &c., and then the original word is *aiōn* (*aión*), as in all instances besides those just mentioned. This word occurs with *σόσμος* in Eph. ii. 2, translated 'the course of this world.'

8. Wherever 'the end of the world,' 'the world to come,' 'the ends of the world' (1 Cor. x. 11), or 'that world' (Luke, xx. 85), or 'the worlds' (Heb. i. 2, xl. 8) occur, the Greek word is *aiōn*. There is one exception (Heb. ii. 5), 'the future *aiōnios*.' *Aiōn* is often used to signify not only an age, but eternity; generally (except in the Gospels) in the plural. The phrases 'before the world began,' and the like, are literally 'before the ages,' or 'from the ages' (the literal rendering is found in Col. i. 26). So also the expression commonly rendered 'for ever and ever' is literally 'to ages of ages;' 'for ever' is 'for the ages.' But the singular is also used in the same senses: of the past—e. g. in Luke, i. 70; John, ix. 32; Acts, iii. 21, xv. 18; of the future—all through the Gospels, except in the Lord's Prayer, and in Luke, i. 38, where the plural is used; also throughout the Epistle to the Hebrews, with the exception of chap. xiii. 8, 21. In 1 Cor. viii. 13, it is translated 'while the world standeth'; in 1 Tim. i. 17, the literal rendering is 'king of the ages.'

PRAY.

'To PRAY,' and 'PRAYER,' represent several distinct Greek words. It is important to notice that some of these are used only of man to man, others also of man to God. Thus, *παρακαλέω* (*parakaleo*), otherwise rendered 'intreat,' 'beseech,' 'comfort,' 'exhort,' 'call for,' is used of prayer to God only once, and that of Christ (Matt. xxvi. 53); *ἴρωται* (*erōtai*) also, 'to ask,' 'beseech,' 'desire,' is used of Christ's prayer to God in John, xvii. 9, twice, 15, 20, but never of man to God, except in a negative clause in 1 John, v. 16.

CONVERT—CONVERSION.

'To CONVERT' stands once only (Matt. xviii. 3) for *στρέφω* (*strephō*), elsewhere rendered 'turn,' 'turn self,' 'turn back,' &c. In other passages the original has the compound verb *ἐπιστρέφω* (*epistrephō*), rendered otherwise 'turn,' 'turn about again,' 'return,' &c. The substantives corresponding, *ἐπιστροφή*, 'conversion,' occur once only, Acts, xv. 3.

REPENT—REPENTANCE.

'To REPENT' is usually (in its theological sense always) *μετανοέω* (*metanoēō*), but it is not unimportant to observe, that the word used in Matt. xxvii. 3 (of Judas) is different, namely, *μεταμελομαι* (*metamelomai*). The other passages where this word is used are Matt. xxi. 29, 32; 2 Cor. vii. 8, twice; Heb. vii. 21.

'REPENTANCE' is *μετανοία* (*metanoia*) only.

The consideration of the following words may illustrate a few interesting passages :—

MASTER.

The word most usually thus rendered in the Gospels is *διδάσκαλος* (*didaskalos*), which signifies 'teacher,' and is always so rendered in St. Paul's Epistles and the Acts. In James, iii. 1, it is again rendered 'Master;*' in Luke, ii. 46, it is the original of 'doctor.' Two other words of the same signification are also rendered 'Master,' viz., *ραββί* (*Rabbi*, which St. John interprets by *διδάσκαλος*, i. 39), and *επιστάτης* (used by St. Luke only for *Rabbi*). In Matt. xxiii. 10, the word used is *καθηγητής* ('leader'), which does not occur elsewhere; for in ver. 8 the genuine reading is *διδάσκαλος*. Twice only in the Gospels *κύριος* is rendered 'Master,' Matt. vi. 24, Luke, xvi. 13. 'Πατρόνι', which St. John explains by *διδάσκαλος*, is, in Mark, x. 51, rendered 'Lord.'

OFFEND—OFFENCE.

The only words thus rendered in the Gospels are respectively *σκανδαλίζω* (*skandalizo*), which signifies 'to cause to stumble,' and *σκάνδαλον* (*skandalon*), 'a stumbling-block,' and conversely. In Matt. xiii. 41, however, the latter is rendered 'things that offend.' In the Epistles *σκανδαλίζω* is rendered 'offend' twice (Rom. xiv. 21; 2 Cor. xi. 29), and 'cause to offend' twice (1 Cor. viii. 13). 'Offend' stands in James thrice (ii. 10, iii. 2) for *πταίω* (rendered 'fall,' 2 Pet. i. 10; 'stumble,' Rom. xi. 11). *σκάνδαλον* is rendered in the Epistles 'occasion to fall,' 'occasion of stumbling,' 'stumbling-block.' Another word of the same signification, *πρόσκομπα*, is once rendered 'offence,' Rom. xiv. 20 (elsewhere 'stumbling-block'), and so is the kindred *προσκόπη* in 2 Cor. vi. 3. 'Void of offence,' 'giving none offence,' 'without offence,' are renderings of the negative of this, viz., *απρόσκοπος*. In all other passages the words rendered 'offend' or 'offence' signify 'sin' or 'trespass.'

BAPTIZE.

The word thus transferred into English is the original of 'wash' in Mark, vii. 4, and Luke, xi. 38. (The original verb is *passive*). The word rendered 'washing' in Mark, vii. 4, 8, and Heb. ix. 10, is a derivative of the same verb, and is rendered 'baptism' in Heb. vi. 2; but the usual word for 'baptism' is another derivative.

* *Sense*—'Do not many of you become teachers, knowing that we shall receive severer judgment.'

STRIVE.

It deserves notice that the word thus rendered in Luke, xiii. 24, is the same that is rendered 'right' in 1 Tim. vi. 12, and 2 Tim. iv. 7. The Apostle, doubtless, alludes to our Lord's saying.

REPRORATE.

The word *ἀδόκιμος* (*adokimos*) thus rendered six times, is in 1 Cor. ix. 27, 'castaway,' and in Heb. vi. 8, 'rejected.' It is simply the negative of *δόκιμος*, which is always rendered 'approved,' except in James, i. 12 ('tried'). In Rom. i. 28, there is a paronomasia, 'As they did not *approve* (or discern) to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to (?) an unproving, i. e., undiscerning mind.' In 2 Cor. xiii. 8-7, there is a similar paronomasia.

ORDAIN.

Taking only the passages in which persons are said to be 'ordained,' we find the following words so rendered. The usual rendering of each word is added.

καθιστημι ('make,' e. g., Rom. v. 19); in Tit. i. 5; Heb. v. 1; viii. 8 (signifies 'to constitute.')

ἐρίζω ('determine'), in Acts, x. 42; xvii. 81.

ποιέω ('do, make'), Mark, iii. 14.

τάσσω ('appoint'), Acts, xiii. 48; Rom. xiii. 1. This verb is the original of 'addicted' in 1 Cor. xvi. 15. (Signifies, 'to set in order.')

τίθημι ('lay,' 'put,' 'appoint'), John, xv. 16; 1 Tim. ii. 7. (Compare 2 Tim. i. 11, same word.)

χειροτονεω, Acts, xiv. 28; rendered 'chosen' in 2 Cor. viii. 19, only occurrences. (Signifies, 'to vote or elect by show of hands.')

CHAPTERS WRONGLY DIVIDED IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

Matt. ix., x.; xvi., xvii.; xix., xx.; xix., xxv.	2 Cor. I., II.; II., III.; III., IV.; IV., V.; V., VI.; VI., VII.; XI., XII.
Mark, VIII., IX.	Gal. III., IV.; IV., V.; V., VI.
John, ix., x.; xviii., xix.	Eph. I., II.; IV., V.
Acts, iv., v.; VI., VII.; VII., VIII.; XXI., XXII.; XXIII., XXIV.	Col. II., III.; III., IV.
Rom. I., II.; II., III.; VII., VIII.; XIV., XV.	1 Thessa. I., II.; II., III.; IV., V.
1 Cor. I., II.; II., III.; III., IV.; X., XI., ver. 1.	2 Tim. III., IV.
	Heb. I., II.; III., IV.; IV., V.; V., VI.; X., XI.
	1 Pet. I., II.

APPENDIX.

LIST OF PASSAGES ILLUSTRATED, OR OF WHICH THE TRANSLATION IS
CORRECTED.

(A refers to Appendix.)

Gen. ii. 7.	Acta, ii. 47.	Eph. iv. 8.
„ iii. 22.	„ iv. 4.	Phil. iii. 11.
„ iv. 23.	„ ib. 9-12.	„ ib. 21.
„ vi. 3.	„ xiv. 23, A.	2 Thess. ii. 12.
Exod. xx. 7.	„ xx. 17.	1 Tim. i. 9.
„ xxxiv. 33-35.	„ ib. 28.	„ ii. 4.
Job, xix. 25, 26.	Rom. i. 28, A.	„ vi. 2.
Ps. cxli. 5.	„ iii. 8.	„ ib. 5.
Prov. viii. 85, 86.	„ v. 4, 5.	„ ib. 10.
„ xviii. 8.	„ vii. 6.	„ ib. 12, A.
„ xix. 18.	„ xiii. 2.	2 Tim. iv. 7, A.
„ xxv. 23.	„ xiv. 23.	Titus, i. 13.
„ xxvi. 22.	„ xv. 4, 5.	„ ii. 11.
* „ xxvii. 6, 14.	„ ib. 12, 13.	„ ib. 13.
Matt. v. 21.	1 Cor. i. 18, 21.	Heb. i. 11.
„ ib. 34.	„ ii. 4.	„ vii. 18, 19.
„ xxiii. 8, 10, A.	„ iv. 4.	„ ix. 11, 12.
„ ib. 37.	„ ib. 5.	„ ib. 15.
„ xxviii. 3, A.	„ xiii. 12.	„ x. 28.
Luke, xiii. 24, A.	„ xv. 44, 45.	„ ib. 39, A.
„ xvi. 8.	„ ib. 55.	James, i. 26, 27.
John, iii. 17, 18.	„ xvi. 15, A.	„ ii. 10, A.
„ v. 18.	2 Cor. iii. 18, <i>sqq.</i>	„ iii. 1, 2, A.
„ ib. 24-30.	„ v. 10, 11.	1 Peter, iii. 1.
„ viii. 22.	„ xli. 1.	„ ib. 15.
„ x. 14.	„ xiii. 8-7.	„ v. 2.
„ xiv. 23.	Gal. i. 11.	2 Peter, ii. 4.
„ xv. 7.	„ iv. 4.	„ iii. 16.
„ ib. 18.	„ v. 8, 4.	Rev. xiv. 13.
Acts, i. 22.	„ vi. 2, 5.	„ xix. 8.
„ ib. 28.		

THE END.

